Board Members

Daniel Larson

Ramona N. Mellott, Ph.D.
Chairperson
Cheryl L. Karp, Ph.D.
Vice-Chairperson
Frederick S. Wechsler, Psy.D. ABPP
Secretary
Bob Bohanske, Ph.D.
Janice K. Brundage, Ph.D.
John P. DiBacco, Ph.D.
Joseph C. Donaldson
Megan Hunter-Williams



State of Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners

1400 West Washington, Suite 235 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Phone: (602) 542-8162 Fax: (602) 542-8279

www.psychboard.az.gov

Staff

Dr. Cindy Olvey Executive Director

Meghan B. Hinckley Deputy Director

Heather Duracinski Administrative Assistant

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL April 9, 2010

1400 W. Washington, Ste. 235 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Arizona State Board of Psychologist Examiners was called to order by Chairperson Mellott at 7:48 a.m. on Friday, April 9, 2010. No Executive Sessions were held.

Chairperson Mellott opened the meeting by welcoming new Board member, Dr. John DiBacco. Dr. DiBacco is a psychologist who practices primarily in the forensic area. He also serves as consultant to Child Protective Services, the Office of the Attorney General, and Office of the Public Offender. Dr. DiBacco serves as adjunct facility at Arizona State University. He earned his Doctor of Philosophy degree in Clinical and School Psychology from the George Peabody College at Vanderbilt University.

2. ROLL CALL

Board Members Participating by Telephone

Ramona N. Mellott, Ph.D. – Chairperson Cheryl L. Karp, Ph.D. Vice-Chairperson Frederick S. Wechsler, Psy.D., ABPP – Secretary Bob Bohanske, Ph.D. John P. DiBacco, Ph.D. Megan Hunter-Williams (8:00 a.m. to 8:05 a.m.) Daniel Larson (8:02 a.m. – 9:26 a.m.)

Board Members Not In Attendance

Janice K. Brundage, Ph.D. Joseph Donaldson

Staff Present

Dr. Cindy Olvey, Executive Director

Attorney General's Office

Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General

Goodman Schwartz Public Affai

Stuart Goodman (7:48 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.)

3. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Dr. Mellott announced the Call to the Public at 7:55 a.m. There were no requests to speak.

4. DISCUSSION, DECISION REGARDING APPROVAL OF APPLICANTS:

Requesting Examination & Licensure

Dr. Wechsler noted that Dr. Bruce Beck was inadvertently approved under the wrong category for licensure at the April 1, 2010 Application Review Committee Meeting. Dr. Beck was approved as a waiver candidate, but has not taken the EPPP. Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Karp and unanimously carried (5-0), that Bruce Beck, Ph.D., having met the requirements of A.R.S. §32-2071 and Arizona Administrative Code R4-26-203, be approved to sit for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology, and be approved for licensure upon receipt of a passing scaled score of at least 500 on the EPPP, and payment of the pro-rated original license fee. Jeanne Galvin, Assistant Attorney General clarified that the Board's motion supersedes the motion made by the Application Review Committee at the April 1, 2010 meeting.

Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Karp and unanimously carried (5-0) that the following applicants, having met the requirements of A.R.S. § 32-2071, be approved to sit for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), and be approved for licensure upon receipt of a passing scaled score of at least 500 on the EPPP and payment of the pro-rated original license fee:

- Lea Didion, Psy.D.
- Janeen DeMarte, Ph.D.
- Margaret Minkus, Psy.D.
- Teresa Imholte, Psy.D.
- Tracy Ristich, Psy.D.
- Alison Steier, Ph.D.
- Alison Ward, Psy.D.

Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Karp and unanimously carried (5-0) that the following applicants having met the requirements of A.R.S. §32-2071(I) or (J) and Arizona Administrative Code R4-26-203, and having passed the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology with a scaled score of at least 500 on the computerized exam or a 70 percent on the written exam, be approved for licensure upon payment of the pro-rated original license fee:

- Mindy Beth Lipson, Psy.D.
- Shari Lewchanin, Psy.D.
- Allison Schechter, Psy.D.
- Maki Obana, Ph.D.

Dr. Wechsler made a motion, seconded by Dr. Karp and unanimously carried (5-0) that the following applicants, having met the requirements of A.R.S. §32-2071 and Arizona Administrative Code R4-26-203, and having passed the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology with a score of at least 70 percent and completed their postdoctoral hours, be approved for licensure upon payment of the prorated original license fee:

- Cassie Faulhaber, Psy.D.
- Jeffrey Rea, Psy.D.
- Natalie Schoenbauer, Psy.D.

Dr. Mellott thanked members of the Application Review Committee for their work.

5. STATEMENT FROM BOARD MEMBER HUNTER-WILLIAMS CONCERNING RECENT CORRESPONDENCE TO THE BOARD AND BOARD MEMBERS REGARDING EVENTS RELATING TO THE GOVERNOR'S BILL SIGNING LETTER THAT ACCOMPANIED HB 2206 AND PRESS COVERAGE OF THE SAME.

Ms. Hunter-Williams stated she wanted to clarify misinformation contained in the letter sent to Board members by Jeri Auther. Ms. Hunter-Williams stated the letter included a statement accusing Ms. Hunter-Williams of contacting the New Times newspaper regarding the legislative bill and ensuing issues from last year. Ms. Hunter-Williams stated that the accusation was not true and the quote attributed to Ms. Hunter-Williams was made on the record in an open meeting of the Board. Ms. Hunter-Williams stated that she was in no way involved in contacting any newspaper or anyone regarding this matter.

6. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING POTENTIAL LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS TO REMOVE THE LICENSING AND REGULATION OF BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS FROM THE JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINERS; BOARD'S POSITION ON A POTENTIAL LEGISLATIVE CHANGE THAT WOULD ALLOW GRANDFATHERING OF CURRENTLY PRACTICING BEHAVIOR ANALYSTS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SAME; UPDATE OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY INCLUDING SB 1087 AND HB 2545

Dr. Mellott stated that the Board met on April 5, 2010 to discuss possible legislation affecting behavior analysts. She indicated that legislation is being considered by the legislature and could potentially be finished before the next in-person meeting of the Board on April 30. Dr. Mellott thanked members of the Board for addressing this issue at this meeting. She advised that additional information is now available and asked Dr. Olvey to share this information with the Board.

Dr. Olvey stated that she was concerned after the April 5, 2010 meeting that Dr. Dan Davidson had expressed strong feelings that the Board, at its December 4, 2009 meeting, had passed a motion that would grandfather behavior analysts who are certified by the national certification board into licensure for a period of three years. The motion contained in the minutes of the December 4, 2009 meeting did not comport with Dr. Davidson's recollection of the motion made at the meeting. In addition, Board members who made and seconded the motion as well as the former Board Chair, and the Board member who voted no on the motion on December 4, 2009, were not present at the April 5, 2010 meeting to clarify their understanding of the motion and surrounding discussion. Dr. Olvey stated that she contacted Dr. Gary Lovejoy, former Board member, who made the motion and participated in the discussion at the December 4, 2009 meeting. Dr. Lovejoy discussed his motion and his understanding of the discussion with Dr. Olvey. Dr. Lovejoy sent Dr. Olvey a statement via email that Dr. Olvey forwarded to Board members and read at the meeting for the record. (See attached email)

Dr. Mellott asked Mr. Stuart Goodman if he had anything to add. Mr. Goodman advised Board members that, based on the motion from the December 4, 2009 meeting as clarified by Dr. Lovejoy, Mr. Goodman agreed to work on behalf of Intermountain Center for Human Development to implement the Board's motion. If consensus is achieved between the Board and behavior analyst, Mr. Goodman indicated he believes he could continue working toward implementation of the Board's motion. Mr. Goodman also stated that he wanted to clarify that the term "grandfather" has a specific meaning in legislation, which he believes is reflected in Dr. Lovejoy's statement.

Dr. Wechsler asked Mr. Goodman to clarify whether he did some work for behavior analysts. Mr. Goodman responded that he was contacted by behavior analysts to help develop legislation that would implement grandfathering for licensure as approved by the Board at the December 4, 2009 meeting, since their efforts have not been successful to date. Dr. Wechsler requested further clarification whether the Board or behavior analysts were paying for his work on SB 1087. Mr. Goodman responded that Intermountain Center is paying for his services. Mr. Goodman indicated that he is under contract with Intermountain to resolve this issue. Further, as long as there is consensus among the Board and behavior

analysts, he is able to work on this matter. If there is a disagreement, Mr. Goodman clarified that the Board is his primary client.

Dr. Wechsler indicated that he does not have a problem with the grandfathering period, but does have a problem with individuals providing supervision who are not licensed by the Board, since the Board has no statutory or regulatory authority over them. Further, he supports the grandfathering period, but does not support anything that suggests supervision may be provided by someone who is not licensed by the Board. If there is a grandfathering period, anyone who wants to provide supervision can apply for a license from the Board and then provide supervision since the supervisor maintains the legal and credible responsibility for the client.

Stuart Goodman agreed with Dr. Wechsler and indicated a slight change could be made in the language that would allow only individuals licensed by the Board to supervise, since the current law would allow supervision by someone who is not licensed by the Board. Dr. Mellott requested clarification regarding individuals who come to Arizona from another state and received supervision in another state. Dr. Wechsler responded that would occur after the grandfathering period. Mr. Goodman further clarified that a grandfathering period will have a cut off date and some people will not meet the requirements within the specified time frame.

Dr. Wechsler added that he wanted to address the issue of paying for supervision. Specifically, he is not opposed to payment for supervision, but would like to be sure that the fee for supervision is reasonable. He indicated that supervisees are at risk of exploitation if fees for supervision are not reasonable. Dr. Wechsler suggested that a fee that does not exceed the hourly billing charged by behavior analysts. Dr. Karp agreed.

Dr. Bohanske stated that he appreciated Dr. Wechsler's clarification. Specifically, he agreed that individuals who provide supervision should be licensed by the Board and should submit an application for licensure, not just supervision. Dr. Karp agreed.

Dr. Mellott asked clarification from Ms. Galvin regarding abdication of responsibility/authority by the Board to a national board. Ms. Galvin responded that the Board appears to be moving toward a grandfathering those individuals certified by the national board; however, that does not have to be the Board's only qualification for licensure. In addition to certification by the national board, additional licensure requirements are the prerogative of the Board. The Board discussed possible requirements in areas such as education, supervised experience, supervision, as well as those qualifications specified in A.R.S. § 32-2091.02.

Dr. DiBacco stated that the current statute allows for supervision without a license. The Board discussed concerns about allowing supervision by individuals who are not licensed in Arizona. Dr. DiBacco expressed concern about setting precedence by grandfathering individuals for licensure. Dr. DiBacco also indicated he would not support moving behavior analysts to another Board. Mr. Goodman underscored that grandfathering would be limited to a designated period of time. Once the time expires, individuals would not be eligible for licensure through grandfathering and would be required to complete the application process established in statute. Language in the bill would indicate the time limited nature of the grandfathering period. Dr. DiBacco asked Ms. Galvin for clarification about setting precedence by allowing the grandfathering period for licensure. Ms. Galvin indicated that the grandfathering period would be time limited and would not continue past the designated date. Mr. Goodman suggested the grandfathering period could appear in Session Law, which would disappear from the statute once the date of the grandfathering period past.

Dr. Wechsler suggested that perhaps three years seems like a long time and the Board may wish to consider a shorter time for the grandfathering period. The Board discussed the length of time for the grandfathering period. Dr. Mellott suggested that the Board may wish to consider a specific length of

time the applicant would need to be certified by the national Board before they can be licensed under the grandfathering provision. Dr. Bohanske observed that one standard in psychology is that individuals who supervise trainees must be licensed for two years prior to conducting supervision and suggested the Board may wish to consider two years as a standard. Board members expressed support for a two year standard.

Dr. Wechsler made a motion seconded by Dr. Bohanske and passed unanimously (6-0) on a roll call vote to support legislation that allows for grandfathering for licensure of individuals certified by the national board for a period not to exceed two years; individuals must have been certified by the national board for a period of at least two years with certification in good standing; at the Board's discretion, the Board may deny an application if substantial change in qualifications has occurred at the national board level; individuals must meet qualifications pursuant to A.R.S. §32-2091.02; a supervisor must be licensed pursuant to this chapter. Board members asked that the grandfather provision be placed in Session Law.

Board members discussed A.R.S. §32-2091.03(E) regarding supervision. The Board expressed an interest in continuing to consider this section of the statute.

The Board asked Dr. Olvey to email the revised bill to Board members for individual review. If any Board member has concerns or wishes to discuss the draft bill, a public meeting will be held.

Dr. Karp acknowledged the contributions of the new members of the Board. Drs. Wechsler and Mellott added their appreciation.

7. NEW AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE BOARD MEETINGS

Board members had no further items for future meeting agendas at this time.

8. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Dr. Wechsler, seconded by Dr. Karp, to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 a.m. The motion carried (6-0).

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick S. Wechsler, Psy.D., ABPP Secretary